

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/537,775	03/29/2000	Minoru Yoshimura	P13998-A	7267	
30743	7590 01/04/2005		EXAM	EXAMINER	
WHITHAM, CURTIS & CHRISTOFFERSON, P.C.			TSEGAY	TSEGAYE, SABA	
11491 SUNS	SET HILLS ROAD				
SUITE 340			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
RESTON, V	/A 20190		2662		
			DATE MAILED: 01/04/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	<del>и_</del>
Advisory Action	09/537,775	YOSHIMURA, MINO	DRU
navious y notion	Examiner	Art Unit	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
	Saba Tsegaye	2662	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 02 December 2004 FAILS TO PLAGE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this application (1) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper re ch places the appli	ply to a cation in
	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires <u>4</u> months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adverent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	risory Action, or (2) the date set forth in th an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o	f the final rejection.	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The danave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens 7 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three meanned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the distatutory period for reply originally set in	fee. The appropriate ex the final Office action; or	tension fee under (2) as set forth in
<ol> <li>A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant'</li> <li>CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF</li> </ol>	-		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:		
(a)   they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search (	see NOTE below);	
(b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Note I	below);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or	simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel NOTE:	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected clain	ms.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	ction(s):		
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	l be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely file	d amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: Se		sidered but does NO	OT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	ere newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-4,6-21 and 23-30</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		1	
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.	/
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme		<u>M</u> .	
10. Other:		Te-M	
<del></del>	HAI	SSAN KIZOV	· <del>··</del>
	SUPERVISOR	Y PATENT EXAMINED OGY CENTER 2600	R

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Examiner carefully reviewed Applicant's arguments filed 12/02/04. The arguments are not deemed to be persuasive. Examiner believes that the claims, given their broad reasonable interpretation, read on the references applied.